

## Custom Calling Service Penetration

	<u>Total</u>	<u>GTE</u>	<u>PB</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hisp</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Asian</u>				<u>Low inc</u>
	%	%	%	%	%	%	<u>Tot</u>	<u>Chin</u>	<u>Kor</u>	<u>Viet</u>	<u>senior</u>
							%	%	%	%	%
<b>Respondent Testimony</b>											
Have CCS	45	45	45	39	54	75	41	45	45	31	16
<b>Customer Records</b>											
Have CCS	44	43	44	36	58	74	47	47	51	42	18
Call Waiting	43	43	43	36	57	73	46	46	51	42	17
Speed Calling	6	26	1	6	10	9	10	14	9	8	6
Call Forwarding	8	26	3	7	11	11	11	15	11	8	6
3-Way Calling	10	26	6	7	16	29	11	15	10	10	7
Call Return	4	-	5	2	7	14	1	*	1	1	1
(No other accounts for more than 1%)											
Have Call Bonus (any)	7	-	9	6	8	14	3	3	6	1	3
Base	(2623)	(1297)	(1326)	(1278)	(766)	(375)	(931)	(317)	(306)	(308)	(428)

Source: Q 35, Table 71

\* Less than 0.5%

**Field Research Corporation**

## Custom Calling Service Penetration

Table 1.27

In a separate section of this report, awareness of Custom Calling Services is shown alongside awareness of ULTS -- see Chapter 2, Table 2.8.

The table opposite compares the percentages who say they have any CCS with the percentages who actually have any CCS according to company records.

It also shows the types of services held by the various groups of customers interviewed.

### *Highlights*

45% of residential customers interviewed say they have any CCS -- this is about the same as the percentage who actually do have such services according to company records: 44%.

Call Waiting shows highest penetration (43%) by far. Ranking far lower in penetration is Three-Way Calling (10%), Call Forwarding (8%), Speed Calling (6%) and Call Return (4%).

**By company:** GTE shows far higher rates of penetration for all of the Custom Calling Services (except for Call Waiting).

**By ethnicity/race:** Penetration of CCS varies greatly by ethnicity/race with Blacks typically much more likely than others to have these services. Hispanics are also somewhat more likely to have at least one of these services than are Whites.

**Low Income Seniors:** Low income seniors do not typically have these services. Only 18% have any CCS, according to company records, vs. 44% for total customers.

## Custom Calling Service Penetration

	<u>Hispanic</u>		<u>Asian</u>		<u>Chinese</u>		<u>Korean</u>		<u>Vietnamese</u>	
	<u>LD</u>	<u>NLD</u>	<u>LD</u>	<u>NLD</u>	<u>LD</u>	<u>NLD</u>	<u>LD</u>	<u>NLD</u>	<u>LD</u>	<u>NLD</u>
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Respondent Testimony</b>										
Have CCS	47	60	38	51	44	47	44	77	30	58
<b>Customer Records</b>										
Have CCS	52	64	46	48	48	46	51	53	41	67
Call Waiting	52	62	46	48	47	45	51	53	41	67
Speed Calling	8	12	9	14	15	12	8	29	7	8
Call Forwarding	8	15	11	14	16	12	10	29	8	8
3-Way Calling	12	20	11	14	16	13	9	29	10	8
Call Return	7	8	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-
(No other accounts for more than 1%)										
Have Call Bonus (any)	5	10	4	1	3	2	6	-	1	-
Base	(444)	(322)	(771)	(160)	(186)	(131)	(289)	(17)	(296)	(12)

## **Custom Calling Service Penetration**

*Table 1 28*

### ***Highlights***

By language dependency:

**Hispanics:** LD Hispanics are LESS likely to have these services than NLD Hispanics, according to company records (52 % vs. 64 %).

**Chinese:** LD Chinese are about as likely to have CCS as are NLD Chinese, according to company records.

LD Koreans are about as likely to have CCS as are LD Hispanics and LD Chinese, according to company records.

30 % of LD Vietnamese say they have CCS compared to 41 % from company records.

## Amounts Pay for Telephone Service

	Total	GTE	PB	White	Hisp	Black	Asian				Low inc
	%	%	%	%	%	%	Tot	Chin	Kor	Viet	senior
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Respondent Testimony</b>											
Basic service											
Mean \$	16	18	15	15	16	23	15	14	17	16	9
Median \$	13	15	13	13	12	19	12	12	14	12	5
Extra cost for calls											
Mean \$	34	40	33	32	35	43	48	54	57	38	19
Median \$	20	29	20	20	20	22	25	20	38	22	10
<b>Customer Records</b>											
Total billed revenue											
Mean \$	33	45	30	33	32	40	36	33	43	31	20
Median \$	23	27	22	22	22	29	23	22	29	20	11
MTS usage											
Mean \$	12	17	10	13	10	11	13	12	17	11	8
Median \$	4	8	3	5	3	4	6	6	8	4	2
Base	(2623)	(1297)	(1326)	(1278)	(766)	(375)	(931)	(317)	(306)	(308)	(428)

Source: Q 111, Table 71

Field Research Corporation

## **Amounts Pay for Telephone Service**

*Table 1.29*

Customers were asked how much they pay for basic service and how much they pay for extra calls. (Other billing data are also reported in Chapter 4 as part of the discussion of the affordability of telephone service.)

Each company also provided Total Billed Revenue (TBR) (including IntraLATA charges) and MTS (IntraLATA) usage charges for customers in all samples.

These data are shown in summary form opposite.

**CAVEAT:** Total Billed Revenue includes all GTE/Pacific Bell charges but not long distance charges. MTS usage is essentially all IntraLATA toll call charges.

### ***Highlights***

On average, residential customers say they pay \$34 a month for calls and \$16 for basic service. Actual MTS usage is, on average, \$12 a month. Average TBR is \$33.

**By company:** According to customer records, GTE customers, on average, pay more for calls than do Pacific Bell customers: \$17 vs. \$10 average MTS. When asked, GTE customers say they spend \$40 (vs. \$33 for Pacific Bell) on extra calls.

**By ethnicity/race:** Korean customers have much higher call costs than other groups: both the mean and median figures for MTS as well as their own estimates of amounts paid extra for calls are much higher than for the other groups. (TBR is also higher for Koreans.) There also appears to be a higher than average incidence of very high volume call users among Chinese: average reported costs for calls is much higher than among most other groups although the median is about the same. Blacks have the highest bills for basic service which probably reflects the very high incidence of CCS among this group.

**Low Income Seniors:** On average, low income seniors report lower costs for basic service and for extra calls than do customers in total. Customer records confirm that low income seniors do, in fact, have lower TBR and MTS usage.

## Amounts Pay for Telephone Service

	<u>Hispanic</u>		<u>Asian</u>		<u>Chinese</u>		<u>Korean</u>		<u>Vietnamese</u>	
	<u>LD</u>	<u>NLD</u>	<u>LD</u>	<u>NLD</u>	<u>LD</u>	<u>NLD</u>	<u>LD</u>	<u>NLD</u>	<u>LD</u>	<u>NLD</u>
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
<b>Respondent Testimony</b>										
Basic service										
Mean \$	13	19	15	15	14	15	16	19	16	16
Median \$	11	14	12	13	10	12	13	15	12	14
Extra cost for calls										
Mean \$	38	33	52	31	68	32	60	32	39	24
Median \$	20	20	28	17	29	15	37	27	22	21
<b>Customer Records</b>										
Total billed revenue										
Mean \$	27	36	36	35	31	35	43	36	31	34
Median \$	18	25	23	24	21	22	29	29	20	20
MTS usage										
Mean \$	8	13	14	13	12	13	17	13	11	11
Median \$	2	4	6	7	5	6	8	8	4	3
Base	(444)	(322)	(771)	(160)	(186)	(131)	(289)	(17)	(296)	(12)

Source: Q.111, Table 71

Field Research Corporation

## Amounts Pay for Telephone Service

Table 1.30

### *Highlights*

By language dependency:

**Hispanics:** LD Hispanics report paying slightly more for extra calls than NLD Hispanics (\$38 vs. \$33). The median, however, is the same for both groups: \$20. LD Hispanics report paying less for basic service, and their MTS usage charges are lower (as is TBR).

**Chinese:** LD Chinese report much higher costs for extra calls than do NLD Chinese. LD Chinese have slightly lower TBR than NLD Chinese (\$31 vs. \$35). Costs for basic service and MTS usage are no higher for LD Chinese than for NLD Chinese.

**Koreans:** LD Koreans show very high TBR and very high MTS usage; they also report much higher costs for extra calls than most others.

**Vietnamese:** LD Vietnamese do not report much higher added costs for calls than do other customers.



## **Chapter 2.0 Awareness, Penetration Rates (among Qualified Customers) and Interest in Universal Lifeline Telephone Service (ULTS)**

Examines:

*Penetration of ULTS among various subsets of customers*

*Percentages of customers who qualify for ULTS*

*ULTS penetration among those who qualify*

*Awareness of ULTS among those who qualify*

*Awareness of ULTS among qualified/don't have*

*Awareness of ULTS and Custom Calling Services*

*Attempts to get ULTS among aware/don't have and among aware/don't have who qualify*

*Interest in ULTS (after told savings on basic rate)*

*Interest in Call Control Service*

## *Type of Basic Service Have (Company Records)*

	<u>Total</u>	<u>GTE</u>	<u>PB</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hisp</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Asian</u> <u>Tot</u>	<u>Chin</u>	<u>Kor</u>	<u>Viet</u>	<u>Low inc</u> <u>senior</u>
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
ULTS (net)	<u>19</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>70</u>
Flat	17	11	18	10	37	21	23	16	12	41	54
Measured	2	1	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	15
Regular (net)	<u>81</u>	<u>89</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>30</u>
Flat	72	83	69	77	56	73	64	68	71	52	27
Measured	9	5	10	11	4	4	11	14	14	5	4
Base	(2623)	(1297)	(1326)	(1278)	(766)	(375)	(931)	(317)	(306)	(308)	(428)

Source: Table 71

**Field Research Corporation**

## **Type of Basic Service Have (Company Records)**

*Table 2.1*

The table opposite shows the type of basic service customers had at the time of the interview. These data are based on company records, not respondent testimony.

### ***Highlights***

About one in five (19%) residential customers has Universal Lifeline Telephone Service. Among both ULTS and non-ULTS subscribers, almost all have flat rate service rather than measured rate service.

**By company:** 11% of GTE and 21% of Pacific Bell residential customers have Universal Lifeline Telephone Service.

**By ethnicity/race:** ULTS penetration is far higher among Vietnamese and Hispanic customers (43%, 40% respectively) than among Blacks, Chinese, Korean or White customers (23%, 18%, 15% and 13% respectively).

## Method for Determining Qualifications for ULTS

Customers who said they had ULTS (after being asked awareness of it) skipped the section of the questionnaire having to do with interest in Universal Lifeline Telephone Service because, if they thought they already had it, it made no sense to ask them their interest in having it. They also skipped the series of questions where the qualifications for ULTS were administered in a very precise way to find those who would qualify so they could be asked their interest in it. This necessitated two methods for determining whether customers qualified for ULTS:

Those who did NOT say they had it (the majority of customers) were read precise categories to determine if they would qualify:

*It happens that the phone company does offer a special type of phone service for lower income persons. In order to qualify for this service, you need to meet certain requirements based on your total household income and the number of people in your household who depend on that income. How many people, including yourself, depend on that income? (RECORD NUMBER). Does that include yourself? (AND THEN:) For \_\_\_ people, you could qualify if your total annual household income is \$\_\_\_ or less. Do you think you would qualify for this service?"*

*IF YES: "For this service, your family cannot have another residential telephone number, that is, you can have only one residential phone number on this service. Also, you cannot be claimed as a dependent or another person's income tax. If you qualify, you must fill out a form each year certifying that you still meet these requirements. Would you still qualify for this service?"*

NOTE: Those who said "yes" to both questions were identified as qualified for ULTS.

Those who said they have ULTS (after being asked if they had heard of the service) were not asked the above series of questions. Instead, a different method was used to determine if they would qualify for ULTS, specifically:

Responses to annual household income and household size (asked at the end of the interview) were examined to see if they qualified. This was a somewhat less precise method for two reasons: (a) the income categories at the end of the customer questionnaire did not include every income category needed for the algorithm and (b) it was necessary to use total persons "in the household" rather than number of persons dependent on the income.

NOTE: Since the limited income/family size definition had to be applied to those who said they had ULTS, they received the benefit of the doubt and were counted as "qualify" in those (relatively few) cases where the limited definition did not provide all of the specific detail needed for the algorithm.

## Percentage Who Qualify for ULTS

	<u>Total</u>	<u>GTE</u>	<u>PB</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hisp</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Asian</u>			
	%	%	%	%	%	%	<u>Tot</u>	<u>Chin</u>	<u>Kor</u>	<u>Viet</u>
Say they have ULTS	<u>22</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>30</u>
Qualify for it (a)	13	9	14	9	28	16	12	10	5	21
Do not qualify	6	4	7	5	6	13	2	3	1	3
Can't determine	3	2	3	2	4	4	4	2	3	6
Do not say have it	<u>78</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>86</u>	<u>90</u>	<u>71</u>
Say qualify (b)	11	12	11	7	20	21	15	9	15	20
Say don't qualify	60	67	59	72	34	37	61	73	68	41
Can't say	7	6	7	6	8	9	7	4	7	9
Total: Qualify ULTS	24	21	24	15	49	36	26	19	20	41
Base	(2623)	(1297)	(1326)	(1278)	(766)	(375)	(931)	(317)	(306)	(308)

(a) based upon responses to Q 909 and Q 924

(b) based upon response to Q 110d

Source: Table 440

**Field Research Corporation**

## Percentage Who Qualify for ULTS

Table 2.2

(See previous page for description of method for determining eligibility for ULTS.)

### *Highlights*

Almost one in four residential customers (24 %) meets the qualifications for Universal Lifeline Telephone Service (ULTS).

**By company:** GTE has slightly fewer qualified customers: 21 % GTE, 24 % Pacific Bell. (Difference is significant at .06 level.)

**By ethnicity/race:** 49 % of Hispanic customers meet the ULTS qualifications as compared to 36 % of Blacks, 41 % of Vietnamese, 20 % of Koreans and 19 % of Chinese and 15 % of Whites.

29 % of all seniors (age 60 and over) qualify for ULTS.

## Percentage Who Qualify for ULTS

	<u>Hispanic</u>		<u>Asian</u>		<u>Chinese</u>		<u>Korean</u>		<u>Vietnamese</u>	
	<u>LD</u>	<u>NLD</u>	<u>LD</u>	<u>NLD</u>	<u>LD</u>	<u>NLD</u>	<u>LD</u>	<u>NLD</u>	<u>LD</u>	<u>NLD</u>
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Say they have ULTS	<u>46</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>10</u>	-	<u>30</u>	<u>17</u>
Qualify for it (a)	38	19	13	6	13	5	6	-	21	17
Do not qualify	4	8	2	3	3	3	1	-	3	-
Can't determine	4	3	4	-	3	-	4	-	6	-
Do not say have it	<u>54</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>92</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>92</u>	<u>90</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>83</u>
Say qualify (b)	28	13	15	11	11	6	14	41	20	17
Say don't qualify	18	50	58	77	67	82	69	47	40	67
Can't say	8	8	7	4	4	4	7	12	10	-
Total: Qualify ULTS	66	31	29	16	24	12	19	41	41	33
Base	(444)	(322)	(771)	(160)	(186)	(131)	(289)	(17)	(296)	(12)

(a) based upon responses to Q 909 and Q 924

(b) based upon response to Q 110d

Source: Table 440

## **Percentage Who Qualify for ULTS**

*Table 2.3*

### ***Highlights***

**By language dependency:**

**Hispanics:** 66% of LD Hispanics meet the ULTS qualifications compared to 31% among NLD Hispanics.

**Chinese:** 24% of LD Chinese meet the ULTS qualifications compared to 12% among NLD Chinese.

**NOTE:** The large majority of Korean and Vietnamese customers are classified as language dependent (i.e. chose to be interviewed in their native language); thus, it is not possible to examine language dependency as a variable within each of these groups. However, it is possible to note that 19% of LD Koreans and 41% of LD Vietnamese meet the ULTS qualifications.



## ULTS Penetration among Those Who Qualify for It

Customers who qualify for ULTS											
	<u>Total</u>	<u>GTE</u>	<u>PB</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hisp</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Asian</u>				<u>Low inc</u>
	%	%	%	%	%	%	<u>Tot</u>	<u>Chin</u>	<u>Kor</u>	<u>Viet</u>	<u>senior</u>
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
% qualify ULTS	24	21	24	15	49	36	26	19	20	41	100
<i>Among this group</i>											
<i>percent who —</i>											
Have ULTS (a)	<u>57</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>70</u>
Flat rate	49	34	53	43	62	34	53	54	36	61	54
Measured rate	8	2	9	12	5	4	6	12	5	4	15
Do not have ULTS (a)	<u>43</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>30</u>
Regular flat rate	40	60	35	39	33	60	33	20	48	31	27
Regular measured rate	4	3	4	6	1	2	8	14	11	4	4
Base	(1280)	(592)	(688)	(457)	(530)	(208)	(246)	(59)	(62)	(125)	(428)
<i>Projected to total —</i>											
Qualify, don't have	10	13	9	7	17	22	11	6	12	14	30

(a) Based on company records

Source: Table 440, 171

Field Research Corporation

## **ULTS Penetration among Those Who Qualify for It**

*Table 2 4*

The table opposite shows ULTS penetration among those who qualify for it. The data are based on customers who actually have ULTS according to company records supplied with the samples.

### ***Highlights***

Over half (57%) of those who qualify for ULTS actually have it according to company records.

**By company:** This is quite different for the two companies: 37% of GTB's ULTS qualified customers have it as compared to 62% of Pacific Bell's ULTS qualified customers who have it.

**By ethnicity/race:** This also varies by ethnicity and race. Penetration is highest among qualified Chinese, qualified Vietnamese and qualified Hispanics (66%, 65% and 66% respectively). Penetration drops to 55% among qualified Whites and 40% among qualified Koreans. It is lowest among qualified Blacks: just 38% have it.

**Low Income Seniors:** 70% of this group have ULTS.

## *ULTS Penetration among Those Who Qualify for It*

---

	<u>Hispanics</u>		
	<u>Total</u>	<u>LD</u>	<u>NLD</u>
	%	%	%
% qualify ULTS	49	66	31
<i>Among this group percent who —</i>			
Have ULTS (a)	<u>66</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>60</u>
Flat rate	62	65	55
Measured rate	5	4	5
Do not have ULTS (a)	<u>34</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>40</u>
Regular flat rate	33	30	39
Regular measured rate	1	1	1
Base	(530)	(353)	(177)
<i>Projected to total —</i>			
Qualify, don't have	17	20	12

## ULTS Penetration among Those Who Qualify for It

Table 2.5

### *Highlights*

LD Hispanics who qualify for ULTS are somewhat MORE likely than their NLD counterparts to have ULTS: 69% vs. 60%.

NOTE: It is not possible to examine language dependency as a variable among the Asian groups because base sizes become too small to provide reliable data.

## **Awareness of Universal Lifeline Telephone Service**

### **Introduction to the questioning**

To measure awareness of Universal Lifeline Telephone Service (ULTS), customers were asked:

*"Have you ever heard of something called Universal Lifeline Telephone Service?"*

IF YES: *"Do you have that service now?"*

IF DO NOT HAVE: *"What do you think that is? Who do you think it is for?"*

All those NOT AWARE of the name or AWARE but cannot describe correctly were then asked:

*"Are you aware that the phone company offers a special type of phone service for lower income people?"*

IF YES: *"Have you ever tried to get this service?" "Do you have it?"*

IF NO: *"Why don't you have it?"*

IF NOT TRIED TO GET IT: *"Why have you not tried to get it?"*

This series makes it possible to measure awareness of the name as well as awareness of the generic service.

Responses are discussed on the following pages.

## Awareness of ULTS: among All Residential Customers

	<u>Total</u>	<u>GTE</u>	<u>PB</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hisp</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Asian</u>				<u>Low inc</u>
	%	%	%	%	%	%	<u>Tot</u>	<u>Chin</u>	<u>Kor</u>	<u>Viet</u>	<u>senior</u>
							%	%	%	%	%
Have heard of ULTS (name)	70	64	72	69	74	76	55	63	40	64	74
Say have it (aware) (b)	20	13	21	14	32	32	16	14	8	25	52
Heard of, don't have	51	51	51	55	41	44	40	49	32	39	21
Can describe correctly	28	29	28	31	22	23	27	31	22	28	8
Close to correct	4	4	4	4	1	4	2	4	1	*	1
Incorrect	7	7	7	8	5	4	3	4	3	1	2
DK what it is	12	11	12	11	13	14	9	10	6	10	10
Not aware or can't describe correctly	52	58	51	54	46	45	58	55	71	47	40
Aware "low income service"	29	32	28	29	32	13	29	30	36	22	19
Say have it	2	2	2	2	6	1	2	*	2	5	11
Total: Know of ULTS (a)	76	74	77	74	86	68	72	75	65	75	80
Base	(2623)	(1297)	(1326)	(1278)	(766)	(375)	(931)	(317)	(306)	(308)	(428)

(a) Includes those who say they have it

(b) Q.102 only

Source: Q.101, 102, 104, 106, Table 34

\* Less than 0.5%

**Field Research Corporation**

## **Awareness of ULTS: among All Residential Customers**

*Table 2.6*

The table opposite shows awareness of ULTS (name and generic service) among all residential customers.

### ***Highlights***

The large majority of customers have heard of something called Universal Lifeline Telephone Service (70%): this includes 20% who say they have it and 51% who have heard of it but do not say they have it. Just over half of the 51% who do not have it but are aware of the name can describe it correctly (28%) leaving 23% aware of the name but not able to describe it. This leaves a total of 52% who are either not aware of the name or are aware but cannot describe it correctly; about half of them or 29% of the total customer base is aware there is a special service for lower income persons.

In sum, 76% can be said to "know of ULTS": 20% say they have it, another 28% are aware of the name and can correctly describe it and another 29% are not aware of the name but are aware there is a special service for lower income households.

**By company:** Total "know of ULTS" does not vary significantly by company.

**By ethnicity/race:** Total "know of ULTS" ranges from a high of 86% among Hispanic customers to lows of 68% among Blacks and 65% among Koreans.

**Low Income Seniors:** Total "know of ULTS" is about the same for low income seniors as it is for customers in total (80% vs. 76%).

## *Awareness of ULTS among Those Who Qualify but Don't Have It*

### Qualify for ULTS but do not have it

	<u>Total</u>	<u>GTE</u>	<u>PB</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Hisp</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Total Asian</u>	<u>Low income senior</u>
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Total know of ULTS	<u>69</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>58</u>
Say have it (a)	20	21	20	18	20	26	19	20
Don't say have, but aware name and describe correctly	23	22	24	26	25	14	22	15
Not aware of name, but aware low income service	26	23	27	25	31	12	25	22
Do not know of ULTS	<u>29</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>42</u>
Base	(326)	(198)	(128)	(106)	(121)	(81)	(101)	(130)
 <i>% of those who know of ULTS who —</i>								
Know by name	62	65	63	63	59	78	63	60
Don't know by name but are aware low income service	38	35	39	36	41	24	38	38

(a) Q.102 only

Source: Q.101 - 106 (Table 232)

**Field Research Corporation**



## **Awareness of ULTS among Those Who Qualify but Don't Have It**

*Table 2.7*

The table opposite looks at knowledge of ULTS among those who qualify for it (respondent testimony) but do not have it (based on company records).

### ***Highlights***

About two-thirds of those who qualify for ULTS but do not have it indicate they know about the service (69%). 20% say they have it, another 23% are aware of the name and can correctly describe what it is and another 26% are not aware of it by name but are aware there is a special lower rate service for lower income people.

This leaves 29% of the qualified/don't have who are not aware of it.

As shown at the bottom of the table opposite, while most of those who are aware of ULTS are aware of it by name, 38% of the total awareness is not triggered by the name.

**By company:** Awareness among the qualified/don't have does not vary significantly by company.

**By ethnicity/race:** Among those who qualify but do not have it, awareness ranges from a high of 76% among Hispanics to just 51% among Blacks.

In all groups, most of those who know about ULTS recognize it by name although Hispanics are the least likely to do so, i.e. only 59% of the total awareness among Hispanics is triggered by the name.

**Low Income Seniors:** 58% of low income seniors who don't have ULTS "know of ULTS" (all qualify by definition).